

S/N 10/000,423

Response to Office Action Dated 12/13/2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 13 2007

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

- A) Claims 15—20, 26—32, 36—39 remain in their original form.
- B) Claims 1—8, 10, 14, 21, 25 and 35 are currently amended.
- C) Claims 9, 11—13, 22—24, 33, 34, 40 and 41 are withdrawn.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims and withdrawal of the rejections.

Restriction/Election

In response to the Restriction, Claims 9, 11—13, 22—24, 33, 34, 40 and 41 have been withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1—4, 8, 14—17, 20, 21 and 25 were rejected under §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0129527, hereinafter "Vaudreuil." In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejections.

Traversal of Rejection of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a computing device, comprising:

- a portable computer; and
- a deployable label base, attached to the portable computer, and configured to display labels associated with the portable computer;
- wherein the deployable label base is configured for movement between a first position and a second position, the labels being viewable in the first position and in the second position at least some of the labels are slid into the portable computer, thereby concealing them from view.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "and in the second position at least some of the labels are slid into the portable computer, thereby concealing them

S/N 10/000,423

Response to Office Action Dated 12/13/2006

1 from view". This is clearly disclosed in Figs. 3 and 5 and associated discussion in
2 the specification, as elected by the Applicant in the Restriction/Election. The
3 Vaudreuil reference fails to disclose a portable computing device within which the
4 label base is retracted. In particular, Vaudreuil fails to disclose any computing
5 device, portable computer or electronic device of any kind.

6 The Patent Office has not suggested that Vaudreuil discloses the elements
7 recited, as amended. In view of the amendment, the Applicant respectfully
8 requests that the Section 102 rejection be removed, and Claim 1 be allowed to
9 issue.

10 Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "a portable computer". Claim 1 also
11 recites that the deployable label base is "attached to the portable computer".

12 The Vaudreuil reference fails to disclose a computing device, a portable
13 computer, or any type of electronic device. Additionally, Vaudreuil fails to
14 disclose an attachment between a label base and a computer device. Accordingly,
15 Vaudreuil is deficient to support a Section 102 rejection of Claim 1, as amended.

16 The Patent Office has depended exclusively on Vaudreuil in making out the
17 rejections of all of the independent claims, including Claims 1, 14, 25 and 35.
18 However, Vaudreuil does not teach or suggest a computing device of any type.
19 Accordingly, in view of the amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that
20 Vaudreuil is deficient to support a Section 102 rejection of Claim 1.

21 For at least the reasons seen above, the Applicant respectfully requests that
22 the Section 102 rejection of Claim 1 be removed.

23 **Claims 2—4 and 8** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable due to their
24 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
25

S/N 10/000,423

Response to Office Action Dated 12/13/2006

1 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are
2 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
3 combination with one another.

4 Claims 5—7 and 10 depend from Claim 1 and were found to have
5 allowable subject matter. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for this
6 determination, which reflects the subject matter recited by each claim individually.

7 **Traversal of Rejection of Independent Claim 14**

8 Claim 14 recites a label display system, comprising:

- 9 • a deployable label base configured to display required labels for an
electronic device; and
- 10 • the deployable label base configured for movement between a first
11 position and a second position, wherein within the first position the
12 labels are viewable and in the second position at least some of the
labels are slid into the electronic device, thereby concealing them
from view.

13
14 Claim 14 has been amended to recite that, “at least some of the labels are
15 slid into the electronic device, thereby concealing them from view”. This is
16 clearly disclosed in Figs. 3 and 5 and associated discussion in the specification, as
17 elected by the Applicant in the Restriction/Election. The Vaudreuil reference does
18 not show or disclose a structure configured to allow retraction of the labels into an
19 electronic device, thereby concealing them the labels view. Accordingly,
20 Vaudreuil is deficient to support a Section 102 rejection of Claim 14, as amended.

21 The Patent Office has not suggested that Vaudreuil makes a disclosure of
22 the elements recited in Claim 14, as amended. Accordingly, the Applicant submits
23 that Claim 14 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests removal of
24 the Section 102 rejection.
25

S/N 10/000,423

Response to Office Action Dated 12/13/2006

1 **Claims 15—17 and 20** depend from Claim 14 and are allowable due to
2 their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable
3 for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 14,
4 are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
5 combination with one another.

6 **Claims 18 and 19** depend from Claim 14 and were found to have allowable
7 subject matter. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for this determination, which
8 reflects the subject matter recited by each claim individually.

9 **Claim 21 has been amended to make independent**

10 Claim 21 has been amended to maintain its scope. The Applicant notes
11 that Claim 21 was apparently not examined by the Office Action mailed
12 12/13/2006. The Vaudreuil reference does not show or disclose the restriction of a
13 flexible base. Accordingly, the Vaudreuil is deficient to support a Section 102
14 rejection of Claim 21.

15 The Patent Office has not asserted that Vaudreuil makes such a disclosure.
16 Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 21 is in condition for
17 allowance.

18 **Traversal of the §103 Rejections**

19 Claims 25, 31 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
20 unpatentable over Vaudreuil. In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the
21 rejection.
22
23
24
25

S/N 10/000,423

Response to Office Action Dated 12/13/2006

Traversal of Rejection of Independent Claim 25

Claim 25 recites, a method, comprising:

- attaching labels for a portable computing device to a deployable label base;
- the deployable label base being moveable between a first position and a second position, wherein the labels are viewable in the first position and in the second position **at least some of the labels are slid into the portable computing device, thereby concealing them from view.**

Claim 25 has been amended to recite, "at least some of the labels are slid into the portable computing device, thereby concealing them from view". This is clearly disclosed in Figs. 3 and 5 and associated discussion in the specification, as elected by the Applicant in the Restriction/Election. The Vaudreuil reference does not teach or suggest a structure configured to allow retraction of the labels into a portable computing device, thereby concealing the labels from view. Accordingly, Vaudreuil is deficient to support a Section 103 rejection of Claim 25, as amended.

The Patent Office has not suggested that Vaudreuil teaches or suggests the elements recited in Claim 25, as amended. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 25 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests removal of the Section 103 rejection.

Claim 31 depends from Claim 25 and is allowable due to its dependence from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in Claim 25, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

S/N 10/000,423

Response to Office Action Dated 12/13/2006

1 **Claims 26—30 and 32** depend from Claim 25 and were found to have
2 allowable subject matter. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for this
3 determination, which reflects the subject matter recited by each claim individually.

4 **Claim 35** recites, a method, comprising:

- 5 • displaying required labels for an electronic device on a deployable
6 label base;
- 7 • the deployable label base being moveable between a first position
8 and a second position, wherein the required labels are displayed in
9 the first position and in the second position **at least some of the**
10 required labels are slid into the electronic device, thereby
11 concealing them from display.

12 Claim 35 has been amended to recite, “at least some of the required labels
13 are slid into the electronic device, thereby concealing them from display”. This is
14 clearly disclosed in Figs. 3 and 5 and associated discussion in the specification, as
15 elected by the Applicant in the Restriction/Election. The Vaudreuil reference does
16 not teach or suggest a structure configured to allow retraction of the labels into an
17 electronic device, thereby concealing the labels from view. Accordingly,
18 Vaudreuil is deficient to support a Section 103 rejection of Claim 35, as amended.

19 The Patent Office has not suggested that Vaudreuil teaches or suggests the
20 elements recited in Claim 35, as amended. Accordingly, the Applicant submits
21 that Claim 35 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests removal of
22 the Section 103 rejection.

23 **Claim 36—39** depend from Claim 35 and were found to have allowable
24 subject matter. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for this determination, which
25 reflects the subject matter recited by each claim individually.

S/N 10/000,423

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Response to Office Action Dated 12/13/2006

MAR 13 2007.**Conclusion**

The arguments presented above are intended to present the Applicant's position clearly, but should not be considered exhaustive. Accordingly, the Applicant reserves the right to present additional arguments to clarify the Applicant's position further. Moreover, the Applicant reserves the right to challenge the status as prior art of one or more documents cited in the Office Action.

The Applicant submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Patent Office's next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted to schedule an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 13 MAR 2007By: 

David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979